



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,716	04/25/2001	Carol S. Gruchala	8285/430	1846

757 7590 11/10/2003
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER

BUI, BING Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

21

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

KS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/844,716

Applicant(s)

GRUCHALA ET AL.

Examiner

Bing Q Bui

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-33, 35-39, 41-49, 51 and 53-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-33, 35-39, 41-49, 51 and 53-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's response filed on. Claims 27-33, 35-39, 41-49, 51 and 53-71 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

Priority

2. The second application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the first application (the parent or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the second application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed Oct. 06, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After closely reviewing the Applicant's Remarks attached to Paper No. 20, Examiner believes that the recited paragraphs reproduced in page 10 do not provide a support to the claimed and disclosed limitation "providing the modified calling party identification number to the called party, whereby the called party receives an identification of the group associated with the calling party instead of an identification of

the calling party” in the present application. Therefore, the priority date for that limitation is “actual filing date of the present application”. As a result, the prior art (Tannenbaum et al / U.S. Patent No. 5,901,209) filing date is still applicable.

For above reasons, Examiner maintains his ground of rejection in view of Tannenbaum et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 27-33, 36-39, 41-49 and 53-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al (US Pat No. 6,130,935) in view of Tannenbaum et al (US Pat No. 5,901,209), herein after referred as Shaffer and Tannenbaum.

Regarding claim 27, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, a method of providing a work-at-home telecommunication service, the method comprising:

(a) receiving a dialed number from a calling party, said calling party being associated with a calling party identification number (col 1, ln 57-col 2, ln 6).

(b) automatically modifying the calling party identification number to an identification number of a group associated with the calling party (col 1, ln 57-col 2, ln 6 and col 4, ln 28-41).

Shaffer differs from claimed invention in which it does not teach the method of providing the modified calling party identification number to the called party, whereby the called party receives an identification of the group associated with the calling party instead of an identification of the calling party. However, Tannenbaum teaches the method of providing the modified calling party identification number to the called party,

whereby the called party receives an identification of the group associated with the calling party instead of an identification of the calling party (see Abstract and col 12, Ins 6-16). Therefore, integrating Tannenbaum's teachings into work-at-home system of Shaffer would have been obvious for providing the called party the true nature of the call.

Regarding claim 28, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of receiving a service specific code from the calling party (col 3, ln 8-38).

Regarding claim 29, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of receiving a vertical service code from the calling party (col 3, ln 8-38).

Regarding claim 30, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of receiving an access code from the calling party (col 3, ln 8-38).

Regarding claim 31, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method further comprising the step of receiving a personal identification number from the calling party (col 1, ln 57-col 2, ln 6).

Regarding claim 32, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, wherein step (b) further comprises the step of sending a query to a service control point, the query comprising the calling party identification number (col 3, ln 39-61).

Claims 33, 41-43, 53-54, 60, 62 and 65, they are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 27.

Regarding claims 36 and 57, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the dialed number comprises a private virtual network number (col 3, ln 24-38).

Regarding claims 37 and 56, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method of further comprising the step of translating the dialed number to a called party identification number (col 1, ln 57-col 2, ln 6 and col 4, ln 42-65).

Regarding claim 38, Shaffer teaches the invention as claimed, the method of further comprising the step of determining a telecommunication carrier for the group associated with the calling party (col 3, ln 24-61).

Claims 39 and 58-59, they are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 38.

Regarding claims 44-45, 55, 61, 63-64 and 66-67, there is provided by Shaffer a system which comprises appropriate means for carrying out the method according to claim 27.

Claims 46-49, they are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 28.

5. Claims 35, 51 and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer (US Pat No. 6,130,935) in view of Tannenbaum (US Pat No. 5,901,209), and further in view of London (US Pat No. 5,590,184).

Regarding claims 35 and 51, the combined system of Shaffer and Tannenbaum teaches the invention substantially as claimed, with the exception of providing the step of sending the modified calling party identification number to a called party associated

with the dialed number in response to a failure of receiving a privacy access code from the calling party . However, it is obvious that Shaffer et al suggest that in response to a call made to a non-virtual network called party, the only ANI associated with a work-at-home agent is translated (modified) into a number of a group and this translated (modified) number is sent along with non-virtual network called party number to an IEC that routes the call to the recipient called party (col 3, ln 39-61). London teaches a number modified from caller identification number is sent to caller-id display unit associated with called party (Abstract and col 3, ln 8-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the Caller-ID service as taught by London that enables the combined system of Shaffer and Tannenbaum to send the identification of business group in place of the agent's identification to a recipient called party.

Claims 68-71, they are rejected for the same reasons as recited in the rejection of claim 35.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bing Bui whose telephone number is (703) 308-5858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 and for formal communications intended for entry (please label the response "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE") or for informal or draft communications not intended for entry (please label the response "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.


BING BUI
PATENT EXAMINER

Nov 05, 2003